IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (original) A screening method, useful to identify compounds affecting motor function in ALS or MND patients, comprising:
administering an anandamide/cannabinoid receptor/acceptor agonist to a mammal having at least one detectable motor function related to an ALS or MND symptom;
detecting any motor function change ; and,
evaluating any such motor function change with respect to a determinable motor function.

2. (original) A method of screening for compounds useful for promoting normal motor function in ALS patients comprising: (a) administering a compound that is a anandamide/cannabinoid receptor/acceptor agonist to a mammal having observable motor function, and (b) evaluating one or more indicia of motor function in said mammal, wherein a compound that promotes normal motor function is identified.

3. (original) A therapeutic method useful for a patient determined to be suffering from one or more abnormal motor symptoms of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis or Motor Neurone Disease, comprising;
administering a predetermined amount of an anandamide/cannabinoid receptor/acceptor agonist, the amount administered being effective to promote normal motor function to the patient.

4. (original) The therapeutic method as in claim 3 wherein the administering is oral, intravenous or sub-lingual, or via a patch or a spray.

COMMENTS

Applicants have received the restriction dated January 12, 2005 and have reviewed it carefully.

The Examiner states that:

"Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121;
I. Claims 1,3 and 4, drawn to a method of screening compounds, and a method of treating, affecting motor function in ALS or MND patients, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2.
II. Claim 2, drawn to a method of screening for compounds useful for promoting normal motor function of ALS patients, classified in class 424, subclass 9.2.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in the MPEP 806.06 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions I and II are directed to distinct methods because they test different subjects and are directed at different goals. Group 1 is directed to a "method of screening [or treating] ...comprising administering ...agonist to a mammal [or patient] having... at least one ALS or MND symptom" , with the goal of affecting motor function. Group II is directed to a "method of screening...comprising: administering a compound... to a mammal having observable motor function", with the goal of promoting normal motor function in ALS patients only. Therefore these methods are distinct because they have different goals and different patient populations. "